

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is believed to be responsive to the Office Action mailed April 19, 2005. In that action: claims 1-6 and 21 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Pettitt (USPN 6,256,073); claims 7-17 and 20 were noted as allowable; and claims 18 and 19 were objected to as dependent on a rejected base claim but allowable if properly amended into dependent form.

No claims are amended in this response. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is hereby requested.

Each of the rejected claims has been rejected based on Pettitt, which discloses a display system using a color wheel. Specifically, Pettit is directed to selecting or binning the color segments of a color wheel to increase light efficiency of the system. The particular efficiency Pettitt is referring to is the ratio of the light (measured in lumens) passing through the color wheel to the light available from the light source (Pettitt at col. 4, lines 19-53). Table 1 discloses the spectral transmission characteristics of three different segments of a color wheel. It is commonly understood that blue light is near the lower end of the wavelength spectrum of visible light, green light is somewhere in the middle of the wavelength spectrum of visible light, and red is near the upper end of the wavelength spectrum of visible light. Thus, one could characterize these three color segments as a low pass filter (blue) which allows only visible light below a specified wavelength to pass, a bandpass filter (green) which allows only visible light between two specified wavelengths to pass, and a high pass filter (red) which allows only visible light above a specified wavelength to pass. This is completely consistent with the paragraph following Table 1 in Petit, which extends from column 5, line 66 to column 6, line 8, where it is stated that

the red longwave cutoff wavelength and the blue shortwave cutoff wavelength are out of the visible range. For this reason, those two cutoff wavelengths are not specified in Table 1. Instead only one cutoff wavelength is stated for each of the red and blue filters, while the green filter has both a shortwave and longwave cutoff wavelength that are specified.

Claim 1, on the other hand, defines a color sequencing system with a color wheel having four segments, with *a fourth segment being broadly transmissive across the wavelength spectrum of visible light* while the broadly-transmissive segment has *a non-uniform transmittance across the visible light spectrum*. Pettitt's only disclosure of a segment that is broadly transmissive across the visible light spectrum is when he briefly mentions at column 5, lines 15-17 that "[a]lternatively, a fourth segment is used to transmit *white* light. The *white* light is used to increase image brightness" (emphasis added). It is clear that Petit's use of the word "white" is meant to indicate the absence of color. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* gives as its first definition of white "free from color: quite colorless and transparent." There is no other detailed discussion by Petit of the characteristics of such a segment. The Office Action states that nothing in Pettitt precludes the "non-uniform transmittance" limitation. On the contrary, it is clear that Petit's teaching of "white" in fact does preclude the colored characteristic that necessarily arises from the non-uniform spectral transmittance that is claimed. The examiner's position is not at all convincing, and surely would not stand up on appeal. Unless this limitation exists in Pettitt, the claim cannot be anticipated thereby. Further, without any suggestion of using a broadly transmissive segment with a non-uniform transmittance across the visible light spectrum or any suggestion/motivation to combine Pettitt with some other prior art reference, the claim is not obviated by Pettitt. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and

dependent claims 2-6, 18, and 19 are patentable. Independent claim 21 is patentable for similar reasons.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

Robert G. Crouch

Registration No. 34,806

3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411

Aurora, Colorado 80014

(720) 562-5506

Date: 12 July 2005